

- 5 -

**REMARKS**

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on November 15, 2006. Claims 11-20 are standing for examination. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (U.S. 5,727,159) hereinafter Kikinis in view of Banerjee (U.S. 6,292,181) hereinafter Banerjee.

In response to the Examiner's rejections, applicant herein amends the independent claims to specifically point out the subject matter applicant believes to be clearly patentable over the art provided by the Examiner. Applicant also provides arguments clearly showing the claims, as amended, are patentable over the art of Kikinis and Banerjee.

Claims 1 and 16 are amended to positively recite that the proxy server is connected to a LAN at the communication center for connecting data and resources of the communication center that are made available to agents local to the communication center. In this manner the remote agent, using a computerized appliance remote from the communication center is capable of having access to data and operating software at the communication center at the same access level of an agent local to the communication center.

Applicant points out that Kikinis provides a proxy server for downloading data from a WEB server. Kikinis teaches that a proxy server connects to an appropriate server and accesses and downloads data. Kikinis specifically teaches the proxy server 19 acts as a proxy for computer 13, performing those functions of Web browsing computer 13 cannot perform. Applicant urges that Kikinis discloses a teaching that is specifically limited to Web browsing.

Banerjee provides a portable interface which can operate software and access data on a standalone PC. Banerjee is clearly limited to accessing tools and software which are local to the standalone PC. There is no suggestion in the art of Banerjee to provide a

- 6 -

portable unit capable of operating all data and software available on a LAN at the communication center available to an agent local to the communication center.

Applicant argues that the ability of the portable device to access and operate databases and software functions at the communication center via an agent's workstation is only taught in applicant's specification. Banerjee makes absolutely no suggestion that the PC has access to software and/or data other than what is housed at the PC.

Applicant believes claims 11 and 16 are clearly patentable over the art of Kikinis and Banjeree as amended and argued above. Dependent claims 12-15 and 17-20 are patentable on their own merits or at least depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended and argued over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully submitted,  
Musa Hanhan

By /Donald R. Boys/  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
831-768-1755